| 1 2 3 4 5 | Laralei Paras, State Bar No. 203319 Seven Hills LLP 4 Embarcadero Center, Suite 1400 San Francisco, CA 94111 Telephone: (415) 926-7247 laralei@sevenhillsllp.com Attorneys for Plaintiff KEEP AMERICA SAFE AND BEAUTIFUL | | FILED Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco 07/23/2021 Clerk of the Court BY: JACKIE LAPREVOTTE Deputy Clerk |
|---|---|--|---|
| 6 7 8 9 | | ΓΗΕ STATE OF CALIFO SAN FRANCISCO IVIL JURISDICTION | ORNIA CGC-21-593483 |
| 11 12 13 14 | KEEP AMERICA SAFE AND BEAUTIFUL, Plaintiff, v. MFAC, LLC, | Case No. COMPLAINT FOR CAND INJUNCTIVE I | RELIEF n 65, The Safe |
| 15 16 17 18 | Defendant. | Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (Health & Safety Code § 25249.5 et seq.) UNLIMITED CIVIL | |
| 19 20 21 | | | |
| 22232425 | | | |
| 262728 | | | |

COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

Plaintiff KEEP AMERICA SAFE AND BEAUTIFUL, acting in the public interest, alleges a cause of action against Defendant MFAC, LLC.

INTRODUCTION AND NATURE OF THE ACTION

- 1. This Complaint is a representative action brought by plaintiff Keep America Safe and Beautiful ("KASB") in the public interest of the citizens of the State of California to enforce the People's right to be informed of the health hazards caused by exposures to di(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate ("DEHP") and di-n-butyl phthalate ("DBP") toxic chemicals found in and on the vinyl/PVC jump rope cords and/or handle grips manufactured, imported, distributed, sold or offered for sale by Defendant in the State of California.
- 2. By this Complaint, plaintiff seeks to remedy Defendant's continuing failure to warn individuals not covered by California's Occupational Safety Health Act, Labor Code § 6300 *et seq*. ("consumers") they are being exposed to one or more substances known to the State of California to cause cancer and birth defects or other reproductive harm through exposures to DEHP and/or DBP, when they purchase, use or handle Defendant's vinyl/PVC jump rope cords and/or handle grips.
- 3. Detectable levels of DEHP are found in and on vinyl/PVC jump rope cords Defendant manufactures, imports, sells or distributes for sale to individuals throughout California.
- 4. Detectable levels of DBP are found in and on the handle grips Defendant manufactures, imports, sells or distributes for sale to individuals throughout California.
- 5. Pursuant to the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, codified at Health and Safety Code § 25249.6 et seq. ("**Proposition 65**"), it is unlawful for a person in the course of doing business to knowingly and intentionally expose consumers in California to chemicals known to the State to cause cancer, birth defects or other reproductive harm, without first providing a "clear and reasonable" health hazard warning to such individuals prior to purchase or use.
- 6. KASB contends and alleges Defendant manufactures, distributes, imports, sells, and offers for sale, in and into California vinyl/PVC jump rope cords and handle grips (collectively, the "PRODUCTS") containing DEHP and/or DBP, without Proposition 65's requisite health hazard warning regarding the harms associated with exposures to the one or more listed chemicals, including, but not limited to, *Perform Better First Place Speed Jump Rope Item Model No. 1139* and

Perform Better Contour Rubber Cable Handle (2 Pack) Item Model No. 5309. Defendant's conduct subjects it to civil penalties for each violation, enjoinment as well as preliminary and permanent injunctive relief. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(a) and (b).

PARTIES

- 7. Plaintiff KASB is a non-profit corporation organized under the laws of California and acting in the interest of the general public, dedicated to protecting the health of California citizens and the environment through the elimination or reduction of toxic chemicals utilized in manufacturing consumer products and to increasing public awareness of those chemicals through the promotion of sound environmental practices and corporate responsibility. KASB is a person within the meaning of Health & Safety Code § 25249.11(a), and it brings this action in the public interest, pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(d).
- 8. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges, at all relevant times, Defendant MFAC, LLC ("**DEFENDANT**") was and is a "person" "in the course of doing business" with ten (10) or more employees, within the meanings of Health and Safety Code §§ 25249.6 and 25249.11.
- 9. DEFENDANT manufactures, imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California, or implies by its conduct that it manufactures, imports, distributes, sells, and/or offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in the State of California.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 10. This Court has jurisdiction over this action, pursuant to Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7, allowing enforcement by any court of competent jurisdiction. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over this action, pursuant to California Constitution Article VI, section 10, which grants the Superior Court "original jurisdiction in all causes except those given by statute to other trial courts." The statute under which this action is brought does not specify any other basis of subject matter jurisdiction.
- 11. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over DEFENDANT, based on plaintiff's information and good faith belief DEFENDANT does sufficient business in California, has sufficient minimum contacts in California, and/or otherwise purposefully and intentionally avails itself of the California market through its manufacture, importation, distribution, marketing or sale of

28 | | / / /

PRODUCTS within the State. DEFENDANT's purposeful availment renders the exercise of personal jurisdiction by California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

12. Venue is proper in the Superior Court for the County of San Francisco, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure §§ 393, 395, and 395.5, because this Court is a court of competent jurisdiction, because plaintiff seeks civil penalties against DEFENDANT, because one or more instances of wrongful conduct occurred, and continue to occur, in this county, and/or because DEFENDANT conducted, and continues to conduct, business in the County of San Francisco with respect to the PRODUCTS that are the subject of this action.

REGULATORY BACKGROUND AND LAW

- 13. In 1986, the people of the State of California approved an initiative addressing the harms caused by hazardous chemicals and declared their right "[t]o be informed about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects, or other reproductive harm." Ballot Pamp., Proposed General Law, Gen, Elec. (Nov. 4, 1986) at p.3.
- 14. Formally known as the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 and codified at Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 et seq., Proposition 65 states, in relevant part, "[n]o person in the course of doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving a clear and reasonable warning to such individual..."
- 15. Under the Act, a "person in the course of doing business" is defined as a business with ten (10) or more employees. Health & Safety Code § 25249.11(b). Businesses are prohibited from exposing individuals to hazardous chemicals without first giving a "clear and reasonable" warning. Health & Safety Code § 25249.6.
- 16. Exposing individuals to hazardous chemicals means to cause individuals to ingest, inhale, contact via body surfaces or otherwise come into contact with a listed chemical. 27 CCR § 25102(i). An exposure to a hazardous chemical is defined as one that "results from a person's acquisition, purchase, storage, consumption or other reasonably foreseeable use of a product…" 27 C.C.R. § 25600(h).

- 17. Under Proposition 65, persons violating the statute may be enjoined in any court of competent jurisdiction and may be subject to civil penalties of up to \$2,500 per day, per violation. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7.
- 18. On October 24, 2003, pursuant to Proposition 65's implementing regulations, California identified and listed DEHP as a chemical known to the State to cause birth defects and reproductive harm. DEHP became subject to the "clear and reasonable warning" requirements one year later, on October 24, 2004. Cal. Code Regs. tit. 27, § 27001(c); Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.8, 25249.10(b).
- 19. On December 2, 2005, pursuant to Proposition 65's implementing regulations, California identified and listed DBP as a chemical known to the State to cause developmental and reproductive toxicity. DBP became subject to the "clear and reasonable warning" requirements one year later, on December 2, 2006. Cal. Code Regs. tit. 27, § 27001(c); Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.8, 25249.10(b).

STATEMENT OF FACTS

- 20. Plaintiff purchased DEFENDANT's PRODUCTS, without a warning, in California.
- 21. Plaintiff investigated and tested DEFENDANT's PRODUCTS at an accredited lab, and consulted with a person with relevant and appropriate knowledge and expertise, who, after reviewing the collected data and analyzing the risk of exposure to DEHP and DBP, determined the PRODUCTS subject consumers in California to exposure to the listed chemicals at levels requiring a warning under the statute, based on touching, handling or otherwise utilizing PRODUCTS in accordance with their reasonably foreseeable and intended usages.
- 22. Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff's attorney executed a certificate of merit, attesting there was a reasonable and meritorious case for this private action and included the factual information supporting the certificate when it served the notice on the California Attorney General's Office, as required. Health &Safety Code § 25249.7(d); Title 11 C.C.R. § 3102.
- 23. Thereafter, on February 18, 2021, plaintiff served a 60-Day Notice of Violation ("Notice"), together with the certificate of merit, on MFAC, Amazon.com, Inc., the California Attorney General's Office, and the requisite public enforcement agencies, alleging, as a result of

28 || / / /

DEFENDANT's sales of vinyl/PVC jump rope cords, consumers in the State of California were, and are, being exposed to DEHP through their reasonably foreseeable use of the vinyl/PVC jump rope cords as intended without first receiving a "clear and reasonable warning," as required by Proposition 65.

- 24. On May 13, 2021, plaintiff served a Supplemental 60-Day Notice of Violation (with Notice, collectively, the "Notices"), together with the certificate of merit, on MFAC, Amazon.com, Inc., the California Attorney General's Office, and the requisite public enforcement agencies, alleging, as a result of DEFENDANT's sales of the PRODUCTS, consumers in the State of California were, and are, being exposed to DEHP and DBP through their reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS as intended without first receiving a "clear and reasonable warning," as required by Proposition 65.
- 25. After receiving plaintiff's Notices, no public enforcement agency has commenced and is diligently prosecuting a cause of action against DEFENDANT under Proposition 65 to enforce the alleged violations that are the subject of the Notices.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of Proposition 65 - Against DEFENDANT)

- 26. KASB realleges and incorporates by reference, as if fully stated herein, the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 30, inclusive.
- 27. DEFENDANT's PRODUCTS contain DEHP and DBP at levels requiring a clear and reasonable warning under Proposition 65.
- 28. DEFENDANT knows or should have known the PRODUCTS it manufactures, imports, distributes, sells, and offers for sale in California contain DEHP and/or DBP. As a result of plaintiff's Notices, DEFENDANT also has actual knowledge of the presence of DEHP and/or DBP in the PRODUCTS.
- 29. The PRODUCTS DEFENDANT manufactures, imports, distributes, sells, and offers for sale in or into the State of California cause exposures to DEHP and/or DBP, both direct and/or indirect dermal contact and ingestion, through the reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS.

30.

continues to cause, exposures to DEHP and DBP.

31. DEFENDANT knows the normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS exposes individuals to DEHP and DBP through direct and indirect dermal contact and/or ingestion.

The normal and reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS has caused, and

- 32. DEFENDANT intends exposures to DEHP and DBP from the reasonably foreseeable use of the PRODUCTS will occur by its deliberate, non-accidental participation in the California marketplace.
- 33. The exposures to DEHP and DBP, caused by DEFENDANT and endured by consumers and other individuals in California, are not exempt from the "clear and reasonable" warning requirements of Proposition 65.
- 34. DEFENDANT failed to provide a "clear and reasonable warning" to those consumers and other individuals in California who have been, or who will be, exposed to DEHP and DBP through direct and indirect dermal contact and/or ingestion resulting from the use of the PRODUCTS as intended.
- 35. Contrary to the express policy and statutory prohibition of Proposition 65, consumers and other individuals, exposed to DEHP and DBP through dermal contact and ingestion as a result of their use of the PRODUCTS that DEFENDANT sold without a "clear and reasonable" health hazard warning, have suffered, and continue to suffer, irreparable harm for which they have no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law.
- 36. DEFENDANT manufactures, imports, distributes, sells, and offers the PRODUCTS for sale or use in violation of Health and Safety Code § 25249.6, and DEFENDANT's violations have continued beyond its receipt of plaintiff's Notices. As such, DEFENDANT's violations are ongoing and continuous in nature and, unless enjoined, will continue in the future.
- 37. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(b), as a consequence of the above-described acts, DEFENDANT is liable for a maximum civil penalty of \$2,500 per day for each violation.
- 38. As a consequence of the above-described acts, Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(a) also specifically authorizes the Court to grant injunctive relief against DEFENDANT.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, KASB prays for relief and judgment against DEFENDANT as follows:

- 1. That the Court, pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(a), preliminarily and permanently enjoin DEFENDANT from manufacturing, distributing, importing, marketing or otherwise offering the PRODUCTS for sale or use in California without first providing a "clear and reasonable warning" to consumers addressing the harms associated with exposures to DEHP and DBP;
- 2. That the Court, pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(a), issue preliminary and permanent injunctions mandating DEFENDANT recall all PRODUCTS currently in the chain of commerce in California that do not bear a clear and reasonable health hazard warning;
- 3. That the Court assess civil penalties against DEFENDANT, and each of them, in the amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation of Proposition 65, in an amount to be determined at trial;
- 4. That the Court award plaintiff its reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit, incurred herein; and
 - 5. That the Court grant any further relief as it deems just and equitable.

Dated: July 23, 2021

Respectfully submitted,

SEVEN HILLS LLP

By:

Laralei Paras

Attorneys for Plaintiff

Keep America Safe and Beautiful